REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were previously pending in the subject application. The Examiner has finally rejected claims 1-16. In an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, Applicant has cancelled claims 11-16, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments, since they neither raise any new matter issues nor present any new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are now pending in the subject application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DAGRACA (U.S. Patent No. 6,646,676) in view of RAMIREZ-DIAZ (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0085998). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of the claims, and requests reconsideration of these rejections in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 recites coordinating "*selective storage* of said *portions of* said plurality of *video frames corresponding to* said *target region*," wherein "said target region representing a specific area to be monitored for movement." The Examiner concedes that DAGRACA fails to disclose the coordinating feature recited in claim 1, but argues that RAMIREZ-DIAZ remedies this deficiency of DAGRACA. The passage of RAMIREZ-DIAZ cited by the Examiner discloses storing and loading an image map to make certain areas of a video camera image insensitive to motion. *See* paragraph no. 51. RAMIREZ-DIAZ's image map in no way shows or suggests "selective storage" of "portions of ... video frames corresponding to ... target region," as recited in claim 1. Rather, RAMIREZ-DIAZ's image map is applied to a video camera image for the purposes of detecting motion, and is separate from the actual video camera image. *See, e.g.,* Figure 9C ("Store Bitmap 702" block is performed and then "Image map masking per cell 706" block is performed for motion detection). Stated in another way, RAMIREZ-DIAZ uses an image map to select areas of a video camera image for performing motion detection, and not for the purposes of selecting which areas of the video camera image should be stored. Indeed, the video database record viewing window in Figure 6 of RAMIREZ-DIAZ shows what appears to be an entire video camera image being stored in the database, rather than any specific portion of that video camera image.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 should be in a condition for allowance.

In addition, claim 7 recites "a *first memory* ... configured *to store* said plurality of *video frames*" and "a *second memory* ... configured *to transfer* said *portions of* said plurality *video frames from* said *first memory to* said *second memory in response to* said *detected movement*." The Examiner has failed to point to any passage in the cited references directed to the "first memory" and the "second memory" recited in claim 7.

Claim 8 recites that "said *first memory* is configured as a *circular buffer* to temporarily store said plurality of video frames." The Examiner has failed to point to any passage in the cited references directed to the "circular buffer" recited in claim 8.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in a condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are any residual issues that can be resolved through a telephone call.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

Dated: <u>November 8, 2007</u>   By:

Cliff Z. Liu
Reg. No. 50,834

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5625
Fax: (650) 857-0663